

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and arguments set forth below. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. New Claims 14-15 have herein been added. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment. Therefore, Claims 1-15 remain pending in the case.

Examiner 's interview

This amendment is responsive to an office action dated July 29, 3002 and an Examiner teleconference dated October 24, 2003, conducted between Examiner Kenneth Kim and Rambod Nader (Reg. No. 47,262). The Examiner is thanked for his time and consideration. During the teleconference, the rejections of Claims 1 and 13 were discussed and a clarification of the reasons behind the rejections were sought.

35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and present the following arguments in support.

Independent Claim 1

With respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection asserts that: 1) "it is not clear what is the consequence of executing the inserted command" and 2) "whether responding to an exception raised relates to precise handling of the exception. "

1) it is not clear what is the consequence of executing the inserted command :

As stated in Claim 1, element "a", the automatically inserted command *tests for and raises floating point status exceptions*, upon its execution. If the inserted command *tests for*

and raises (i.e. detects) exceptions that have been raised as a consequence of executing a sequence of floating point instructions, the process of Claim 1, element "b" begins. Thus, the inserted command *tests for and raises exceptions* caused by the execution of a sequence of instructions.

2) Whether responding to an exception raised relates to precise handling of the exception:

Applicants have herein amended Claim 1. In light of the amendment to Claim 1, Applicants believe that the rejection is moot as to "whether responding to an exception raised relates to precise handling of the exception."

Hence, the execution of all the elements of Claim 1 allow the *automatic insertion of a command that tests for and raises exceptions* detected after a sequence of instructions including floating point instructions, and upon the discovery of such exceptions, the process *returns to a point in the instruction sequence where the state is known*, and by *executing each instruction singly*, each of the floating point instructions causing an exception are identified. Applicants assert that Claim 1 does clearly particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention.

Claims 2-12

Claims 2-12 are dependent claims of Claim 1. As such, Claims 2-12 are patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claim 13

Claim 13 has herein been amended. Claim 13 is an apparatus claim for automatically detecting exceptions, similarly to Claim 1. As such, the comments made with regards to Claim 1 are equally applicable to Claim 13. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 13 is patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above.

Claim 14-15

Claims 14 and 15 have herein been added. Applicants assert that independent Claim 14 and the dependent Claim 15 are patentable over the cited art.

Conclusion

For these reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-15 are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited by Applicants.

Date: October 27, 2003

Respectfully submitted



Ronald M. Pomerenke

Reg. No. 43,009